DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 172 839 JC 790 286

AUTHOR Hansen, Evelyn Unes
TITLE Advising Time Inventory: Consequences of the General College Individualized Baccalaureate Degree Program on Faculty Advising, Activities, and Academic Load. The General College Studies, Volume XV, Number 2.
INSTITUTION Minnesota Univ., Minneapolis. General Coll.
PUB DATE 27 Oct 78
NOTE 19p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Bachelors Degrees; *Educational Counseling; *Faculty Advisors; *Faculty Workload; *Individualized Programs; Junior Colleges; Noninstructional Responsibility; Organizational Change; *Postsecondary Education; School Surveys; Student Needs

ABSTRACT

In order to determine if the recently instituted, individualized baccalaureate (BA) degree program at General College had affected the time spent in, and the nature and scope of faculty advising, this study identified how much "real time" was spent by faculty in advising, with whom, and on what kinds of activities. During the winter quarter, 1978, each of the 96 faculty members were assigned three randomly selected weeks in which to record each advising contact; the length of time involved; the topical purpose of the meeting; and the classification of the advisee by year, program credits, and primary place of registration. Results indicated that faculty spent 5,274.5 hours in advising during the quarter--an average of 55.9 hours for each faculty member invested in 147.2 visits. The day school student body was comprised of 80% associate of arts students, 5.1% adult special students, 7.5% BA students, and 7.5% who were not designated. Day school students received 76% of the advising time; BA students (both day students and Continuing Education and Extension students) received 12.9% of the time. Additionally, in advising day students, faculty spent 22.4% of their time on baccalaureate program-related activities. Thus, the study revealed that the individualized baccalaureate degree program required more advising time than expended in advising conventional lower-division programs. (MB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

THE GENERAL COLLEGE STUDIES
University of Minnesota
The General College
106 Nicholson Hall/216 Pillsbury Drive S.E./ Minneapolis, Minn. 55455

ED172839

Volume XV, Number 2 1978-79

ADVISING TIME INVENTORY: CONSEQUENCES OF THE GENERAL COLLEGE INDIVIDUALIZED BACCALAUREATE DEGREE PROGRAM ON FACULTY ADVISING, ACTIVITIES, AND ACADEMIC LOAD

Evelyn Unes Hansen

The General College began to accept candidates for individualized baccalaureate degree programs in 1971. Its faculty undertook this venture in the tradition of the college: largely on faith and the will to succeed. Already heavy workloads were taxed further to provide services which had to be rendered if the project was to be sustained. For example, counselors and advisors soon found themselves spending hours and hours in one-to-one meetings with potential applicants for degrees, helping them to define needs, state goals, draw up programs of study, and make vocational plans.

Faculty of the General College routinely are assigned advising responsibilities in addition to their teaching loads. Full-time members, for example, advise 35-40 students per year. Little provision could be made to adjust advising function and academic load in the light of circumstances created by the new degree programs. As a result, advisors, faced with the complex and time-consuming matters that adhere to individualized learning programs, felt under mounting pressure. Moreover, the program attracted large numbers of evening school students who also sought advice, and, upon admission, expected to be assigned a faculty advisor.

Strained by the overburden, faculty participated in this study to identify how much "real time" they spend in advising, with whom, and on what kinds of activities. Evidence from this study was used to support their request for recognition by the college of the changed nature and full scope of their advising work. This evidence of the impact of individualized programs upon faculty advisors may prove useful to institutions contemplating similar ventures.

This report is the second in a series reporting research and evaluation in the General College baccalaureate programs. The first, a study of faculty attitudes toward the program, appeared in General College Studies, Volume XV, Number 1, 1978-1979.

Norman W. Moen

JC 790 286

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Evelyn Unes Hansen
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Editorial Board: The General College Research Group

ADVISING TIME INVENTORY: CONSEQUENCES OF THE GENERAL COLLEGE INDIVIDUALIZED BACCALAUREATE DEGREE PROGRAM ON FACULTY ADVISING, ACTIVITIES, AND ACADEMIC LOAD

Evelyn Unes Hansen

with research assistance from

Paul J. Feltovich, Ph.D.
Thomas Brothen, Ph.D.

University of Minnesota

October 27, 1978

ADVISING TIME INVENTORY: CONSEQUENCES OF THE GENERAL COLLEGE INDIVIDUALIZED BACCALAUREATE DEGREE PROGRAM ON FACULTY ADVISING, ACTIVITIES, AND ACADEMIC LOAD

Evelyn Unes Hansen

with research assistance from

Paul J. Feltovich, Ph.D.
Thomas Brothen, Ph.D.

Introduction

Advising in individualized degree programs is not "business as usual" (Lindquist)[1]. Advising in these programs is different in kind, degree, and quantity from patterns of traditional undergraduate program advising (Berte)[2]. In individualized programs, advisers have a significant part in the student's passage through all of the stages of the learning process -- analysis, application, synthesis, evaluation (Bloom)[3]. And the demands of their part make them partners of students involved in this endeavor (Berte)[4].

Faculties who may be planning individualized degree programs might avoid later difficulties (Lindquist)[5] by studying these differences between the familiar routines of traditional advising roles and the demands placed on them by new roles in nontraditional learning relationships. Failure to perceive the differences and to prepare for adjusting to and learning new roles may fuel other problems (Bradley)[6] and ultimately impair program quality.

This study is related to our failure to percieve the differences and to make adequate preparation for them (Hansen and Moen)[7] before embarking on a program of individualized baccalaureate study in the General College. Prior to 1971, study in this College terminated in the Associate in Arts degree, advising was primarily related to work with students who were engaged in lower-division study, and full-time faculty members were assigned 35-40 advisees per year. In 1971, the College extended its mission to include individualized programs of study leading to Bachelor of General Studies and Bachelor of Applied Studies degrees. As a result of that decision, new and diverse groups of varying ages and at varying stages of academic progress were added to our student population. However, the basic number of advisees remained constant and for some faculty, increased largely, while at the same time, the nature and scope of adviser's work changed. Faculty, strained by the pressures and feeling overburdened, have asked for relief.

This Study

To determine if our requests for relief have a valid basis in fact, we conducted a study during Winter quarter 1978 to discover what advisers' work in this College now entails. The purpose of our study was to identify how much "real time" faculty spend in advising, with whom, and on what kinds of activities.

The study extended over twelve weeks, the first ten of which were "teaching" weeks. The eleventh was final examination period. The twelfth was an interim between the end of examinations and the beginning of Spring quarter. Throughout the twelve weeks, selected faculty

members recorded each advising contact, length of time involved, topical purpose of the meeting or work session, and classification of the advisee by year, program, credits, and primary place of registration -- whether day school of Continuing Education and Extension (CEE). This is a report of the results of that study.

Procedure

We selected for inclusion all faculty who had had advising assignments during Fall quarter 1977 and who were in residence during Winter 1978, a total of 96 persons. Each of the 96 was assigned, at random, three of the twelve weeks of the quarter. Each was asked to record all advising contacts for those weeks. No faculty member was assigned to record in any two successive weeks. Approximately 25% of the full group of 96 -- 24 or 25 faculty -- was active each week.

Dr. Paul Feltovich designed the form faculty used for recording the information we sought from them about their advising time and activities. We distributed the form with brief instructions a few days in advance to all who were scheduled to be active in a particular week. We included two descriptive categories for identifying advisees, by student classification and place of primary registration, and six descriptive categories for indentifying purposes and topics of the advising sessions. For each advising session during the week, we asked the faculty member to classify the student on the two descriptors, and to record the time spent (in minutes) on the various topical categories.

Faculty Response

Not all of the 24 or 25 faculty selected to be active each week returned their recording sheets to us. Not all of the recording sheets returned were usable. Forms were considered unusable if nothing had been recorded for the entire week, or if faculty failed to report times spent in topical categories, and instead checked ( ) only that a category had been discussed.

Table 1 (Appendix A) shows the usable numbers of responses for each week and the total of 209 for the entire period of the study. Because numbers of responses in weeks eleven (8) and twelve (10) are so small, results from those weeks should be treated with special caution throughout the report.

Adjustment Procedure

Figures given in this report are adjusted figures. Adjusted figures represent an estimate for the full faculty based on the sample of returned forms, and were arrived at by scaling up figures from the usable responses by 96/U, where U = usable faculty responses for the week. As an example, during week 1, the total advising load tabulated from 20 usable responses was 117.2 hours. The adjusted time, or estimate for the full faculty, is therefore (117.2 x 96/20) or 562.6 hours.

Caveats

No distinctions among classifications or ranks of faculty members are made in the reporting of these results. In particular, figures for HELP Center and Student Personnel counselors are lumped with those for teaching faculty. Because, in keeping with our promise of anonymity to the faculty, we did not distinguish teachers from counselors, our

results may show advising figures that can be somewhat misleading. Applied to the teaching faculty, the figures may be overestimates. Applied to those faculty for whom advising/counseling is assumed a more major part of their job, the figures may be underestimates. Information by classification and rank is available and can be retrieved, but such analysis would require prior approval of the faculty.

Results

What is the advising-counseling load of General College faculty and how does it vary throughout the quarter? Faculty spent a total of 5374.5 hours in advising during Winter quarter 1978, an average of 55.9 hours for each faculty member invested in 147.2 visits. The advising load varies considerably throughout the quarter, reaching its peak during weeks of registration, as may be seen in figures for weeks 1, 8, 9, and 10 in Table 2 (Appendix A).

How were advising hours distributed among various groups of advisees? Table 3 (Appendix A) shows advising time spent with advisees whose primary place of registration is General College day school, those from Continuing Education and Extension, and others from neither GC Day nor CEE. This "other" category represents a variety of groups including students from high schools, from other colleges or post-secondary institutions, and persons not currently in any college who come to our faculty for advice or consultation about our programs and their individual needs. These conclusions follow from the data shown in Table 3:

1. 76.2% of advising time in an average 9.1 visits per week is spent advising GC day school students.
2. The remaining 23.8% of advising time is taken by students outside the GC day school.
   a. Of this, 10.3% in an average of 1 visit per week is spent advising students from Continuing Education and Extension.
   b. 13.5% of faculty advising time is taken by others who are neither GC day school nor CEE students.

Advising by General College faculty extends beyond the number of formally assigned advisees for whom they are given responsibility. To think solely in terms of those day school registrants as constituting the faculty's full advising load is to overlook the fact that other students account for 23.8% -- a large proportion -- of total advising time.

What proportion of advising time is given to baccalaureate program students relative to that given other groups of our student population? Table 4 (Appendix A) shows advising time given the full population of students, regardless of primary place of registration. Groups of advisees are identified on this set of descriptors of academic progress:

- FrSo (Freshman-Sophomore, not in baccalaureate program)
- +90 credits (but not in baccalaureate program)
- BP (student has been admitted to baccalaureate program)
- Other (student not describable by above categories)

We intended the "Other" category as a means of identifying advisees who had not yet established any college record. It might include students from high schools, vocational-technical and other post-secondary institutes, nursing programs and allied health professions, and those who might be seeking college entrance. From data given in Table 4 for the full population of students, advising was distributed among groups at various stages of academic progress as follows:

1. 63.77%, a total of 3219.2 hours, to Freshman and Sophomores
2. 13.3%, a total of 748.3 hours, to students above 90 credits
3. 12.1%, a total of 794.7 hours, to students who have been admitted to the baccalaureate program
4. 10.9%, a total of 584.1 hours, to others

Because our day school records are more complete than those we have for the full population of students, and thus allow for more discrete classification of students by academic progress, we may derive more accurate proportional estimates of advising time by using that information. At the time of this study, actual day school enrollment figures for the quarter were not yet available. As an alternative, we used the official registration lists for Winter 1978 which gave, by categories shown below, these figures for students who had been admitted to General College, had no "holds" on their records, and were considered <u>eligible</u> to enroll:

AA Students	2364	80.0%
Adult Special students	150	5.1%
Baccalaureate Program students	220	7.5%
Not designated	221	7.5%

Analysis of the registration lists reveals that students admitted to baccalaureate programs comprise 7.5% of the day school population. As may be seen in Table 5 (Appendix A), that 7.5% of the population received 12.9% of the total advising time given during the quarter.

To make a more precise estimate of the proportion of advising time given to the total group of baccalaureate program students relative to their percentage of the full population, we based our calculation on figures shown above from registration lists and on "enrollment" numbers provided us by CEE. Of 1267 CEE "enrollments" for General College courses in Winter 1978, 112 represented students admitted to baccalaureate programs. For the full student body, these are the figures we arrived at:

	BP	%age of Total	non-BP	%age of Total
Day school eligible	220		2735	
CEE enrolled	112		1155	
Total	332	7.9%	3890	92.1%

Table 6 (Appendix B) shows the 7.9% of the full student body comprised of baccalaureate students received 16.6% of total advising time given.

How much advising time is taken by baccalaureate program activities? We defined baccalaureate program activity as time taken by baccalaureate students plus time taken by other students for matters directly related to baccalaureate programs. Such matters may include explanation of program requirements, help in program planning, preparation of application for admission, organization and development of the Senior Report, and assorted personal problems. We provided six topical categories on the recording form for faculty's use in classifying their baccalaureate program activities.

Given data for the full population of students, as compiled in Table 7 (Appendix A), we learn that 27.4% of advising time was spent on baccalaureate program activities. Given data for the day school population only, as compiled in Table 8 (Appendix A), we learn that 22.4% of advising time was spent on baccalaureate program activities.

When all reported advising-counseling contracts attributed to baccalaureate program students are compiled by students' primary place of registration, what percentage of baccalaureate program advising is shown for students in Continuing Education and Extension (CEE)? Given the data shown in Table 9 (Appendix A), we learn that CEE students received 34.8% of the total baccalaureate student advising during Winter quarter 1978. Using day school registration lists and CEE enrollment figures once again, we may calculate the percentage of CEE baccalaureate students from among the total number of that group as follows:

	BP	%age of Total
Day school eligible	220	66.3%
CEE enrolled	112	33.7%
Total	332	100 %

The 34.8% of total advising time given to baccalaureate students registered through CEE approximates their proportion of the total group as shown by the percentages in the preceding calculations.

Summary

General College faculty members spent an average of 55.9 hours each in advising work during Winter 1978. Slightly more than 3/4 of the time (76.2%) was given to General College day school students, while slightly less than 1/4 of the time (23.8%) was given to non-day school students.

Freshmen and sophomores (AA students) comprised 80% of the total day school population and received 72.4% of advising time; baccalaureate program students comprised 7.5% and received 12.9%; adult specials and others comprised about 12.5% and received 14.7%. Of the full student

body (day school, CEE, and others*) baccalaureate program students comprised 7.9% of the total population and received 16.6% of advising time.

In advising students from the day school population, faculty spent 22.4% of their time on baccalaureate program activities and 77.6% on other matters; in advising students from the full student body, they spent 27.4% on baccalaureate program activities and 72.6% on other matters.

Of 332 total baccalaureate program students, 66.3% (220) were day school registrants, while 33.7% (112) enrolled through CEE in Winter 1978. Of all advising time spent on baccalaureate program activity, 34.8% was devoted to the 33.7% of the group who enrolled through CEE. 63.6% of the time was devoted to the 66.3% of day school registrants.

Conclusion

Individualized baccalaureate degree programs require more faculty advising time than that expended in advising about conventional lower-division programs. In General College, the proportion is double. More than a third of all time spent by General College faculty in advising about baccalaureate programs is given to students registered in evening programs through the Continuing Education and Extension Division, and is, therefore, over and above the regular assigned day school advising load.

*Others may include students from Rochester CEE and also some who may be enrolled in other colleges of the University. 1.8% of the advising time was given to such student.

Bibliography

1. Jack Lindquist, "Strategies for Contract Learning," in Learner-Centered Reform: Current Issues in Higher Education, edited by Dyckman W. Vermilye. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975. pp. 75-78.

2. Neal Berte, ed. Innovations in Undergraduate Education: Selected Institutional Profiles and Thoughts about Experimentalism. University: New College, University of Alabama, 1972.

3. B.S. Bloom, J.T. Hastings, G.F. Madaus. Handbook on Formative and Summative Evaluation of Student Learning. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

4. Neal Berte. Individualizing Education Through Contract Learning. University: New College, University of Alabama, 1977.

5. Jack Lindquist. Op. Cit., pp. 79-80.

6. A. Paul Bradley, Jr., "Faculty Roles in Contract Learning," in Learner-Centered Reform: Current Issues in Higher Education, edited by Dyckman W. Vermilye. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975, p. 67.

7. Evelyn Unes Hansen and Norman W. Moen. "Baccalaureate Programs: Progress Report 1977-1978," The General College Newsletter (XXIV:2) April 1978. Minneapolis: The General College.

Appendix A: Tables

1. Usable Faculty Responses by Week
2. Advising Load by Week
3. Advising for GC-Day Students versus Others
4. Advising for BP Students versus Others in the Full Population of Students
5. Distribution of Advising Time in the General College Day School Population, AT = adjusted time (hrs), SPP = Student Program Progress
6. Distribution of Advising Time in General College Day School plus Continuing Education and Extension (AT = adjusted time in hours)
7. BP Activity Advising versus All Other Advising in Full Population (AT = adjusted time in hours)
8. BP Activity Advising versus All Other Advising in Day School Population (AT = adjusted time in hours)
9. Baccalaureate Student Advising for CEE, Day, and Other Students (AT = adjusted time in hours)

APPENDIX A: TABULATED RESULTS*

Table 1. Usable Faculty Responses by Week

Week	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Responses	20	21	18	20	17	20	18	23	17	17	8	10	209

Table 2. Advising Load

Week	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Time for full faculty (hrs)	562.6	413.9	176.6	429.4	411.6	433.7	302.3
Time per faculty member (hrs)	5.9	4.3	1.8	4.5	4.3	4.5	3.1
Visits per faculty member	15.8	13.7	6.1	12.0	10.8	8.9	8.8

8	9	10	11	12	Total Qr.	Av./Wk.
655.3	746.3	602.3	320.2	320.3	5374.5	447.8
6.8	7.8	6.3	3.3	3.3	55.9	4.6
18.6	22.2	14.2	9.5	6.6	147.2	12.2

*There may be minor inconsistencies between table totals. Two data handling procedures account for this. First, some error results from rounding to the nearest tenth. And second, the SPSS Breakdown program's default option of table-wide deletion was used for cases with missing data. This causes table totals to be based on slightly different numbers of cases.

Table 3. Advising for GC-Day Students versus Others

Week	Student Place of Primary Registration	Adjusted Visits	Adjusted Time (hours)	Time/ Visit (min.)	Visits/ Faculty Member	% of Advising Load
					Qtr./Wk.	
Total	GC Day	10494	3965.6	22.5	109.3 9.1	76.2
Qtr.	CEE	1420	545.8	22.8	14.8 1.2	10.3
	Not GC nor CEE	1858	724.9	23.5	19.4 1.6	13.5

Table 4. Advising for BP Students versus Others in the Full Population of Students

Week	Student Program Progress	Adjusted Visits	Adjusted Time (hours)	Time/ Visit (min.)	Visits/ Faculty Member	% of Advising Load
					Qtr./Wk.	
Total	Fr-So	9089	3219.2	21.2	94.8 7.9	63.7
Qtr.	+90 cr.	1895	748.3	21.3	19.8 1.65	13.3
	BP	1724	794.7	32.1	18.0 1.5	12.1
	Other	1574	584.1	23.3	16.2 1.3	10.9

Table 5. Distribution of Advising Time in the General College Day School Population, AT = adjusted time (hours), SPP = Student Program Progress

Week	Student Program Progress	Adjusted Time (hours)	%	Total GC Day School
Total	Fr-So	2881.4	72.4	
Qtr.	+90 cr.	515.4	12.9	
	BP	513.4	12.9	
	Other	65.6	1.8	
				3975.8

Table 6. Distribution of Advising Time in General College Day School plus Continuing Education and Extension Division (AT = adjusted time in hours)

Week	Student Program Progress	Adjusted Time (hours)	%
Total Qtr.	Fr-So	3089.3	67.5
	+90 cr.	616.8	13.5
	BP	760.9	16.6
	Other	110.1	2.4
	GC plus CEE	4577.1	

Table 7. BP Activity Advising versus All Other Advising in Full Population (AT = adjusted time in hours)

Week	BP Activity		Other		Total
	AT	%	AT	%	
Qtr.	1431	27.4	3793	72.6	5224

Table 8. BP Activity Advising versus All Other Advising in Day School Population (AT = adjusted time in hours)

Week	BP Activity		Other		Total
	AT	%	AT	%	
Qtr.	885.6	22.4	3071.9	77.6	3957.5

Table 9. Baccalaureate Student Advising for CEE, Day, and Other Students (AT = adjusted time in hours)

Week	Place of Primary Registration					
	GC Day		CEE		Other*	
	AT	%	AT	%	AT	%
Qtr.	512.7	63.6	280.3	34.8	12.8	1.6

*Other may include students from Rochester CEE and also some who may be enrolled in other colleges of the University.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

JUL 27 1979

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES